

## DETERRENCE AS THE CORNERSTONE OF A COUNTER-TERROR STRATEGY

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DANIEL E. STOLTZ  
United States Army

### DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.  
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. <b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 14-03-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  Deterrence as the Cornerstone of a Counter-Terror Strategy				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Lieutenant Colonel Daniel E. Stoltz				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  Dr. J. Boone Bartholomees Department of National Security and Strategy				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This paper offers the option of deterrence as opposed to preemption as part of a broader counter-terror strategy. It by no means proffers that this course of action is the only one that may or may not be feasible, but it does take a hard line approach to solving a seemingly unsolvable problem by a means that many have forsaken. In order to deter, one must be willing to punish. A nation must be willing to accept a certain amount of world condemnation for its actions. If a nation is not steadfast in its belief and assertions to punish those who violate the clear boundaries established, then deterrence is nothing more than an empty threat or a bluff, and one's enemies will continue to whittle away at your way of life and defenses. If a nation questions its own authority as a world power to hold others accountable, then it must also be willing to abdicate its responsibility and be prepared to subject itself to someone else's authority to establish the boundaries and hold your nation subservient to them. You either make the rules or you live under those who do; it is that simple.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Islamic Extremism; GWOT; Preemption; Terrorism; Rogue; Smart Power; DIME					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES  24	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)



USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**DETERRENCE AS THE CORNERSTONE OF A COUNTER-TERROR STRATEGY**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Daniel E. Stoltz  
United States Army

Dr. J. Boone Bartholomees  
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College  
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013



## **ABSTRACT**

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Daniel E. Stoltz

TITLE: Deterrence as the Cornerstone of a Counter-Terror Strategy

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 14 March 2009      WORD COUNT: 5,570      PAGES: 24

KEY TERMS: Islamic Extremism; GWOT; Preemption; Terrorism; Rogue; Smart Power; DIME

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This paper offers the option of deterrence as opposed to preemption as part of a broader counter-terror strategy. It by no means proffers that this course of action is the only one that may or may not be feasible, but it does take a hard line approach to solving a seemingly unsolvable problem by a means that many have forsaken. In order to deter, one must be willing to punish. A nation must be willing to accept a certain amount of world condemnation for its actions. If a nation is not steadfast in its belief and assertions to punish those who violate the clear boundaries established, then deterrence is nothing more than an empty threat or a bluff, and one's enemies will continue to whittle away at your way of life and defenses. If a nation questions its own authority as a world power to hold others accountable, then it must also be willing to abdicate its responsibility and be prepared to subject itself to someone else's authority to establish the boundaries and hold your nation subservient to them. You either make the rules or you live under those who do; it is that simple.





## DETERRENCE AS THE CORNERSTONE OF A COUNTER-TERROR STRATEGY

Deterrence is above all a psychological problem. The assessment of risks on which it depends becomes less and less precise in the face of weapons of unprecedented novelty and destructiveness. A bluff taken seriously is more useful than a serious threat interpreted as a bluff.”

—Dr. Henry Kissinger

Deterrence must never be a bluff. In order to effectively deter, a nation must be prepared to carry out its threats of retaliation if the target acts outside the range of acceptable behavior. Deterrence must be thought of in much broader terms than just military might. It must also include diplomacy, informational campaigns and economic threats in order to persuade and dissuade one's enemies. It must be made absolutely clear that any person, group or nation that attacks the United States of America and its allies will be made to suffer such destructive retribution that the price to be paid will not be worth the initial gain from the attack. After the demise of the Soviet Union, many people believed that deterrence was no longer an effective tool of United States foreign policy. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, in New York, Washington, DC and Pennsylvania, others argued that it was not U.S. deterrence that had ultimately failed, but rather that the U.S. had simply failed to deter. After all, how many terrorist attacks occurred against U.S. interests that went virtually unanswered? Some recent examples include the 1998 U.S. Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania that killed 224; the direct attack on the USS Cole in 2000 that killed 17 service members; the 1985 hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship that resulted in the death of one American; and the 1996 truck bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that resulted in 19 U.S. service members being killed and 240 other Americans being injured. In each of these cases of terrorist attacks against U.S. interests, there was either no response by the

U.S., or at most, the launching of cruise missiles against suspected terrorist camps in the deserts of Afghanistan.<sup>1</sup>

The United States' overwhelming lack of direct action following these attacks only served to embolden its enemies. After 911, a popular belief arose that the western world had an enemy that could not be deterred. The newly accepted wisdom became that it was not possible to deter enemies that represented no homeland and did not value their own lives or at least were willing to die for their cause. How is it possible to deter people who apparently value nothing other than their beliefs and whose ultimate goal encourages their own death? The United States adopted with vigor a new policy of dealing with terrorists and rogue nations; one known as anticipatory self-defense or preemption. However, time has shown that preemption is not the ultimate answer. Deterrence does work, but there is no cookie-cutter answer to what constitutes effective deterrence. All enemies are different, and therefore, all enemies value different things. Policymakers and military leaders must determine what it is that our disaggregated enemies value and then threaten that. Only when the world stands up and takes action against what extremists hold dear can we possibly hope to defeat this terroristic Islamist ideology.

In order to deal with our enemies, we must determine how we arrived at this point. We must determine who our enemies are - both rogue states and individuals. We must determine what it is they hold dear and then establish a clear and concise policy that will outline the consequences for those who violate our interests. Our policy must include, not just military might, but all aspects of smart power as described by Secretary of State Clinton at her confirmation hearings.<sup>2</sup> We must punish economically

those nations that either actively or passively support those who do harm to the United States and its allies. We must articulate this policy to the world in order for it to understand that when we do attack, it is purely defensive in nature and proportional. Lastly, we must weigh the risks involved with taking a hard stance and be willing to accept the condemnation that will inevitably come from some nations and even from some leaders within our own system. It is only then that we can hope to have a measureable, long-term effect on our enemies.

So how did the United States of America, as the sole world superpower, get to this point? Why did it so readily discard the technique of deterrence that seemed to be a proven method for dealing with global threats? Why did the U.S. as a nation buy into the belief that this new religiously ideological zealot of an enemy did not value anything? Certainly all humans value something. Violence is always the easiest form of action and reaction, but it may not be a good deterrent threat in many cases. That is not to argue a military response is inappropriate, but rather that the U.S. must couple its tremendous military might with a well thought out and thoroughly conveyed deterrence plan. This plan must include all aspects of smart power; Diplomatic, Information, Military and Economic (DIME). Only when coupled with military might or the threat of it, can diplomacy, informational and economic threats be brought to bare against our enemies.

In the 2002 National Security Strategy, the President stated the United States can no longer simply rely on traditional nuclear deterrence to keep terrorists at bay or defensive measures to thwart them at the last moment. The fight must be taken to the

enemy, to keep them on the run.<sup>3</sup> In his speech at West Point in 2002, President Bush emphasized this same point when he said,

Deterrence—the promise of massive retaliation against nations—means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies.<sup>4</sup>

In his speech to the Heritage Foundation in October, 2003, Vice President Dick Cheney also reiterated this view when he said,

The strategy of deterrence, which served us so well during the decades of the Cold War, will no longer do. Our terrorist enemy has no country to defend, no assets to destroy in order to discourage an attack. ...There is only one way to protect ourselves against terrorist violence, and that is to destroy the terrorists before they can launch further attacks against the United States.<sup>5</sup>

Unfortunately, both the former President and the Vice President were incorrect in their assertions and assumptions. For President Bush to state that retaliation means nothing to terrorists is only half correct. We must first find out what these shadowy terrorists hold dear, and then threaten that by retaliation when they violate U.S. interests. For the Vice President to claim that the terrorists have no assets may be too simplistic an assessment. Assets can range from money to businesses to family and friends, and it is certainly plausible to seize monetary and business assets as well as hold accountable physical assets including family and friends. The Vice President also oversimplified his assertion that we must destroy the terrorists. This thought process is part of the problem with the United States' vague end state for the Global War on Terror; it is simply not feasible to eradicate the tactic known as terror from the world. Only through clearly defined deterrence can we hope to dissuade our enemies from future attacks.

So why was the policy of deterrence that was so effective in helping the United States win the Cold War so quickly abandoned? Has revisionist history made it appear that everyone agreed during the Cold War that the concept of deterrence and mutually assured destruction was the absolute correct policy to pursue at that time? Is it believed in today's world that both liberals and conservatives agreed because the world was a simpler place and everyone knew deterrence would work? Of course not, but that appears to be the belief that has brought us to this point of abandoning such a potentially suitable policy for the future. Deterrence was not a policy that won the Cold War because everyone agreed on both sides of the aisle in Congress. Rather, deterrence was the best course of action from several bad options. Right wing, anti-communists thought deterrence was too weak and a concession to the Soviet Union and Eastern Block. The liberal left, on the other hand, argued against deterrence as an immoral use of terror as a threat and railed against the very existence of nuclear weapons. Since neither the right nor the left could win majority support for one platform over the other, deterrence won out as the best option that few liked but all responsible parties could support.<sup>6</sup>

Akin to the challenges that we as a nation face today, some believed that the United States needed to initiate preventive strikes in the late 1940s against the Soviet Union and China before they could field nuclear weapons. This same argument is made today in 2009 for the same reasons against Iran and North Korea. So how have we as a nation forgotten our past world threats and challenges and discarded the option of deterrence? Why now after we previously learned to begrudgingly accept rival

nations developing nuclear weapons are we prepared to initiate preemptive strikes and full scale invasions if our new enemies develop the capability?

Ultimately, abandoning deterrence was the easiest thing to do; which certainly does not make it the correct thing to do. Hardline advocates of U.S. primacy believe that a deterrent posture would prevent the United States from exercising regional hegemony in the Middle East or East Asia. Neoconservatives and liberal interventionists who support democratization, halting of genocide and other humanitarian agendas believe that deterrence is too hesitant about such interventions. And lastly, the pacifist left wing liberals continue to argue that deterrence itself is a system of terror based on the mere existence of nuclear weapons. Ultimately, the U.S. may have to accept proliferation and changes in balances of power in the world. It is truly ignorant to believe that the United States and its allies can effectively halt the spread of technology in today's world. Rather, the U.S. and its allies must accept that proliferation, while it may increase security challenges, will not drastically alter the underlying dynamics of the current order.<sup>7</sup>

All of that notwithstanding, an achievable deterrence policy is the only option that is based on reality. It is certainly not a viable option for the United States to go to war with every nation in a preemptive manner in order to simply prevent that state from garnering nuclear capabilities or harboring terrorists. An achievable deterrence policy is by no means an answer to every situation. When the United States failed to deter leading up to the 911 attacks, it became clear to all, and acceptable to most, what the U.S. must do in response. Giving the Taliban a chance to hand over the terrorists or risk being attacked was clearly proportionate and defensive in nature. It was the right

answer. The attack against the Taliban served as a credible deterrent against other rogue states that may have doubted the resolve of the United States. Deterrence failed and other actions had to be considered as the next step; just as nuclear war would have ensued if the former Soviet Union and the United States had reached an impasse during the Cold War. That is what defines a credible deterrence policy; you may actually have to make good on your threats. Our future policy of deterrence must be clear to all nations and it must be credible.

Despite Cold War deterrence being linked almost entirely with nuclear response options, today's deterrence must include a small nuclear response option as part of a broader policy. Since the U.S. arsenal of nuclear weapons comprises warheads that are hundreds of kilotons each, they are simply not credible as a response to smaller chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear (CBRN) attacks. Even the most reckless regimes of the world and super empowered individual terrorists understand that the U.S. will not use its massive nuclear weapons in response. It is for that very reason that the U.S. must continue research on and the development of low-yield nuclear weapons.<sup>8</sup>

The 1993 Spratt-Fuse Law bans any research and development of nuclear weapons that have yields of less than five kilotons. Despite the House of Representatives amending this law in 2003 to allow for research, it still does not allow for development and production.<sup>9</sup> In order to effectively deter, the deterrence must be credible. Lower yield mini-nukes would allow for that option. Individual terrorists and rogue leaders would have to rethink their positions knowing that the U.S. would have the option of employing lower yield tactical nukes against them in retaliation.

This now brings us back to the argument of how do you deter an enemy that may have a nation he represents such as a leader of a rogue state (Syria, Iran and North Korea, for example) as well as the individual terrorist who does not represent a country and who ultimately desires his own death as part of his fanatic ideologies? Contrary to popular thought, deterrence is not negated by an opponent's willingness to die for his cause. Rather, deterrence is based on the fact that even the most dedicated terrorist values something and it is that fact that makes everyone deterable.<sup>10</sup> This leads us then to the need to understand what it is that our enemies value. Whether it is life, clan, tribe, family, party, privilege, hold on power or aspirations, every human values something. Only through accountability and the threat of punishment can deterrence work. Even rogue states are susceptible to deterrence since their leadership is generally committed to remaining in power. North Korea's Kim, Jong-Il and his family value his place as the great leader of that society and will do all within their power to maintain their grip on power. The same holds true for Syria's weak Assad family dictatorship. Iran's mullahcracy and revolutionary leadership are deeply committed to maintaining their regime and attempts to increase their power, not just in their region but throughout the world.<sup>11</sup>

U.S. deterrence policy must hold true whether the target violates U.S. policy openly or through shadowy support to terrorists. If the United States demands that no rogue state launch or enable through third parties (i.e., terrorists) a WMD strike against either the United States or any of its allies and backs that threat up with assurance to respond with crushing force, there is no reason to believe the deterrence would not work.<sup>12</sup> The demand is both reasonable and defensive in nature, which would garner a



majority of world support, and the response is credible and attainable. No dictator, tyrant or ideological zealot would be foolish enough to attack or support an attack by third parties on the United States or its allies if he truly believed that the United States would immediately and overwhelmingly crush his hold on power, his family, his wealth, his military, and his infrastructure. However, the United States must first rid itself of the self-imposed handicap of nation building after an attack. It serves as a deterrent to us and may prevent us from attacking in response if we as a nation believe that we will have to spend years, billions of dollars, and perhaps American lives to rebuild a nation that we retaliated against. If the U.S. is provoked into a response against a nation due to that nation's support of an attack, then that nation can also suffer the challenge of fixing itself. Just because we break it, does not mean that we must fix it. Nation building leads to stagnation and long-term susceptibility of the U.S. military and other government agencies that become involved in seemingly endless efforts to rebuild a nation. If we establish and make clear our parameters to all nations, any nation that violates them must suffer the consequences.

The argument over whether the U.S and its allies went to war in Iraq for credible reasons aside, there is no doubt that the leaders of other rogue nations took notice when Saddam Hussein's military was crushed, his party driven from power, his sons killed and he was removed from power, captured like a common criminal and later tried by his own people, convicted and executed. That is a deterrent against other rogue states that cannot be fully measured, but is nonetheless highly effective.

After the cowardly attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States acted quickly and decisively and with popular world support to dislodge the Taliban from

power in Afghanistan. However, this stopped just short of targeting the actual terrorist masterminds themselves. Although both Usama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri were targeted unsuccessfully by the military, the United States could have pursued further action by immediately punishing the entire bin Laden and al-Zawahiri families economically and by cutting all ties with both Pakistan and Saudi Arabia until such time as both bin Laden and al-Zawahiri were captured or killed or turned over to the United States or its allies for prosecution. Terrorists from the lowest foot soldier to the financiers and upper echelon leadership may have differing levels of commitment, but all are susceptible to threats against their families, their livelihood, their wealth, their homes and so on. It is these areas that must be focused on for deterrence. Homes can be seized or bulldozed just as the Israelis did with the homes of Palestinian suicide bombers.<sup>13</sup> This may be considered drastic, but it would also be effective and a great deterrent against future terrorists.

Individual foot soldiers like those who boarded our planes on September 11, 2001, may be the most difficult to deter based on their level of extreme ideology, education level and our ability to reach them. Martyrdom against an infidel during jihad is considered a great honor, but also carries with it monetary rewards for the martyr's family members.<sup>14</sup> Family members of a martyr are often compensated with payments ranging from \$12,000 to \$15,000. The act of martyrdom is often considered such a heroic deed that martyrs receive glorious funeral ceremonies and immortalization of the individual through graffiti, portraits and trading cards.<sup>15</sup> Since the rewards to surviving family members are so great and glorious, it is obvious that many suicide bombers do hold their families as sacred. It is this value that must be targeted for deterrence. An

article by Major General Doron Almog of the Israeli Defense Force points out how Israel dissuaded a potential suicide bomber by threatening his family, not physically, but rather financially:

In early 2003 an Israeli agent in the Gaza strip telephoned Mustafa, a wealthy Palestinian merchant in Gaza, to inform him that over the previous three months his son Ahmad had been preparing for a suicide bombing mission in Israel. Mustafa was told that if his son followed through with his plans, he and his family would suffer severe consequences: their home would be demolished and Israel would cut off all commercial ties with Mustafa's company. Neither he nor the members of his family would ever be permitted to enter Israel again. Faced with this ultimatum, Mustafa confronted his son and convinced him that the cost to his family would far outweigh any possible benefits his sacrifice might have for the Palestinian people.<sup>16</sup>

Certainly both Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are two of the United States' greatest allies in their region, but that is exactly the reason they must be made to partner more effectively with our fight against terrorists or suffer sanctions. Both nations are actively involved with the U.S. in the global war on terror, but certainly not to the extent that they should be. Both countries must increase their active pursuit of terrorists. But more importantly, they must publicly renounce all terrorists and their false jihad. This rhetoric is severely lacking in all Muslim nations that are our allies. The United States sells billions of dollars worth of military weapons and supplies to Saudi Arabia each year through foreign military sales.<sup>17</sup> Although Saudi Arabia is a very wealthy nation, its need for weaponry is a vulnerability. Since 2001, Pakistan has become one of the largest recipients of U.S. security assistance, including arms transfers; from FY2002 to FY2006, President Musharraf's regime received nearly \$1 billion in Foreign Military Financing (grant aid provided to foreign countries specifically for the purchase of U.S. weapons) and signed government-to-government agreements for nearly \$4.34 billion in U.S. weaponry, according to the Defense Department.<sup>18</sup> Pakistan has also received

about \$10 billion in U.S. aid since 2001, though the U.S. maintains that about half of that is to reimburse Pakistan for expenses incurred in the fight against terrorist groups.<sup>19</sup> It certainly cannot be successfully debated that the path we have chosen for the last eight years has been very effective when it comes to capturing the two main leaders of Al Qaeda. While the previous years have certainly seen a decrease in terrorist attacks against the U.S. and its allies, we can also assume that we cannot maintain the state of war we currently find ourselves in indefinitely.

Although not all terrorist activities are tied directly to Islam, a majority of terrorists groups do use Muslim countries to hide and train in and espouse their anti-humanitarian filth under the guise of the Quran and Islam. Certainly not all Muslims are terrorists or even support terror or violence against non-Muslims. It would be ludicrous, naïve and criminally dangerous to make such an absurd assumption. However, all Muslims must speak out more clearly and under a unified voice if they truly desire to reclaim their religion as one of peace. Education must play a major role in this shortcoming. In order to effectively deter, we must recognize a major inability in our potential enemies; their inability to read, comprehend, analyze and act based on their own personal intelligence. How can deterrence work against any enemy if that enemy does not possess the intellectual ability to read, write, judge intelligently or comprehend what we are trying to tell him? Illiteracy among Muslims of the world is higher than any other religion of its size; an astonishing 47 percent.<sup>20</sup> With some clerics preaching the word of the Quran without ever having read it in the first place, it is obvious they only have the ability to pass on what they were told and taught. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy that the cycle of hatred for other religions and the west will only continue if the Muslims

of the world are not able to think and analyze for themselves. With a few exceptions, the silence from the Muslim world has been deafening over the years. It is impossible to deter an enemy if that enemy is ignorant about what you are trying to convey. Only through attempting to educate the Muslims of the world can the West have any hope of one day helping them understand, not only their own religion better, but to make their own judgments. This also applies to the hardline extremists who still want to practice jihad so that they may understand the United States' policy of retaliation.

Further, deterrence must be tied to economics. After President George W. Bush's speech following the 911 attacks, he warned the world that they were either with us or against us in our fight against terrorism. Unfortunately, more than seven years after we were attacked, U.S. policy has yet to dramatically change with regards to economic support to nations that encourage jihad and support the oppressive treatment of non-Muslim citizens in Muslim countries. Foreign aid to countries such as Kosovo, Algeria, Somalia, Sudan, Egypt, Jordan, Palestine, Pakistan, and Indonesia, should be stopped until each country demonstrably stops all support (materiel, educational, and religious) for jihadist warfare and grants full equality of rights to non-Muslim citizens.<sup>21</sup> The ceasing of foreign aid must be tied to a comprehensive information campaign in order to inform the citizenry of that nation and the world that all aid will be immediately restored once their government takes corrective action. The world must be made to understand how much money the United States and its allies provide to nations that we fundamentally disagree with but support for humanitarian reasons nonetheless. The U.S. State Department must engage Muslim nations more proactively and demand the renunciation of Sharia expansionism. This is not to argue against Muslim countries'

inherent right to practice the law of Islam within their own borders, but rather, they must make concessions with regard to humanitarian treatment of non-Muslims, and they must not practice expansionism. Just as the Allies stopped the expansionism of communism during the Cold War, so too must Sharia expansionism be halted.

Another economic deterrent toward oil producing countries that support terrorism or espouse jihad, is for the U.S. to gain independence from their oil in order to use their number one export against them. Whereas there may always be a need for oil, viable and abundant alternatives will allow for options in order to hurt them economically. The Obama administration and the U.S. Department of Energy must make research and development of alternative energy sources its number one priority in order to wean our dependence on foreign oil and cause the nations that monopolize oil production and trade to rethink their policies regarding globalization and interaction with the Western world. As President Obama stated in his inaugural address:

...and each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet...We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. All this we will do.<sup>22</sup>

Only through devoting money, time and resources to a project much like the Manhattan Project will we ever free ourselves from our need for foreign oil. We must recruit and develop our brightest minds and scientists to solving this problem, and then share that knowledge with the world to free them from oil dependency as well. Every country values power, whether regional or global, and it is only through money that power can be maintained. Oil producing nations of the world will be crippled financially and have to learn to make concessions or fail to retain their grip on power and their

place in the global economy. Using the deterrent threat to cease purchasing their oil is a very viable economic deterrent if the U.S. has other domestic power sources.

The recommendation for deterrence that includes both overwhelming military and economic responses is both risky and challenging, but it would not be an effective deterrent if it weren't. Obviously, cutting off all aid to countries that enforce anti-humanitarian practices toward non-Muslims will be condemned by many and viewed as anti-humanitarian in its own right, as well as being viewed as an attack on the Muslim religion as a whole. That is an acceptable risk and will eventually cease as an effective argument once some of the countries capitulate and begin receiving aid again. Once that occurs, it will only increase the pressure on those nations that continue to hold out and play the hard line. Overall, a renewed policy of deterrence is the most feasible and suitable of any option. Preemption is not a policy that can be maintained without eventually depleting America of its most valuable resource, its military service members. Deterrence is a defensive, tailored and more moral policy than that of preemption. Since deterrence is defensive in nature, it is more widely accepted by other nations as the proper policy since it justifies retaliation only in response to an attack; not the perception of a pending attack. It is also a tailored response in that it clearly defines what the United States' response will be if it is attacked and is thus both justifiable and proportionate. Lastly, because it does establish specific criteria that will result in retaliation by the U.S. government, it is governed by a legitimate authority. All of these factors demonstrate the need for renewed consideration for a suitable deterrence policy. Just as our previous deterrence policy of the Cold War was suitable and just as well as

effective, so too will a deterrence policy toward rogue states and non-state actors in the future.

There are risks involved with taking such a hard line approach to counter this global insurgency. When dealing with an enemy that uses our weaknesses against us, we must adapt, even if for just the short-term, and overcome our weaknesses. One of the greatest strengths of the United States of America is also one of its greatest vulnerabilities - its Constitution. The enemies of the United States fully understand our Constitution's provisions outlining individual freedoms, due process, and habeus corpus. If we have any hope of defeating an enemy who studies us and uses our own laws against us, then we must be willing to potentially suspend some of our rights in order to keep our enemies off balance and safeguard our own interests.

In his inaugural address after being sworn in as the 44<sup>th</sup> President of the United States, Barack Obama stated:

As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born: Know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and that we are ready to lead once more.<sup>23</sup>

President Obama's assertion that we as a nation have given up laws and rights for expedience's sake is incorrect. We as a nation should be willing to suspend certain laws and rights in the greater good of bringing to justice our enemies, as well as helping to deter future acts of terror against us.



In April 1861, President Abraham Lincoln suspended habeas corpus in the interest of preserving the union and safeguarding the populace. Habeas corpus establishes a person's right to appear before a judge before being imprisoned. When a judge issues the writ, he commands a government official to bring a prisoner before the court so he can assess the legality of the prisoner's detention. When the privilege of the writ is suspended, the prisoner is denied the right to secure such a writ, and therefore, can be held without trial indefinitely. Habeas corpus is the only common-law tradition enshrined in the Constitution that also explicitly defines when it can be overridden. Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution states, "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it."<sup>24</sup> When President George W. Bush ordered the imprisoning of terrorists at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and their subjection to military tribunals, it was denounced throughout much of the world as well within the liberal elite of the United States as inhumane, illegal and unconstitutional. President Bush exercised his rights as President under the Constitution of the United States just as President Lincoln had done over 140 years earlier. Although neither case was widely popular, nor were they ever declared unconstitutional. It is this very courage that President Obama must maintain as a possibility when taking action. To tell the world that we will not give up the rule of law and the rights of man only serves to let our enemies know that we are backing away from a method that has hindered them for the previous eight years. Every time we as a nation publicly dissent with one another over our policies and make speeches that reach our enemies, we are making their job much easier. Of course, we must have dissent

within a democratic system of government, but we must also practice some common sense within our own system.

With a new administration firmly in power in the United States, we are at a crossroads. The status quo of the previous administration will obviously change, but the biggest question remains; what direction will the Obama administration take with regard to the military and terrorism? Since preemption is not an option and smart power is used frequently as the new buzzword in Washington, D.C., the time is now to once again revive the concept of deterrence. A clear, well understood, and viable deterrence policy that includes all aspects of DIME is the answer. Our enemies must be made to understand that any action they undertake against the U.S. or its allies will not be worth the incredible and overwhelming price they will have to pay from our retaliation. It is a proven and well documented strategy, that when effectively and consistently used will provide the United States with a new strategy well beyond our current wars and take us well into the remainder of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> "Summary of Evidence Against Osama bin Laden in 9/11 Terror Attacks", October 5, 2001, <http://www.everything2.com/title/Summary%2520of%2520evidence%2520against%2520Osama%2520bin%2520Laden%2520in%25209%252F11%2520terror%2520attacks> (accessed March 14, 2009); "USS Cole", October 13, 2000, <http://www.everything2.com/title/USS%2520Cole> (accessed March 14, 2009); Christopher Hellman and Victoria Garcia, "Chronology of Major Terrorist Attacks Against U.S. Targets", <http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/chronology-pr.cfm> (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> CBS Interactive Inc., "Clinton: Use ""Smart Power"" in Diplomacy", (Washington, D.C.), January 13, 2009, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/01/13/politics/main4718044.shtml> (accessed 14 March, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> President George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy Of The United States of America*, (Washington, DC: The White House, March 2006), 8.

<sup>4</sup> TeachingAmericanHistory.org, “President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech”, West Point, N.Y., June 1, 2002, <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=916> , (accessed 14 March, 2009).

<sup>5</sup> Vice President Dick Cheney, “Meeting the Challenge of the War on Terrorism”, Speech to the Heritage Foundation, October 17, 2003, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/homelandsecurity/HL802.cfm>, (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>6</sup> Elbridge Colby, “Restoring Deterrence”, *Orbis* 51, no 3 (summer 2007): 424.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 426.

<sup>8</sup> Uri Fisher, “Deterrence, Terrorism and American Values”, *Homeland Security Affairs*, No. 1, (February 2007), 7, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=3.1.4>, (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

<sup>10</sup> Elbridge Colby, “Restoring Deterrence”, *Orbis* 51, no 3 (summer 2007): 415.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 418.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, 419.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, 421.

<sup>14</sup> Uri Fisher, “Deterrence, Terrorism and American Values”, *Homeland Security Affairs*, No. 1, (February 2007), 10, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=3.1.4>, (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>15</sup> Ibid

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Defense Security Cooperation Agency “Arms Sales Notifications” [http://www.dsca.mil/PressReleases/36-b/36b\\_index.htm](http://www.dsca.mil/PressReleases/36-b/36b_index.htm), (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>18</sup> “U.S. Arms Sales to Pakistan: New CRS Report”, November 2007, [http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2007/11/us\\_arms\\_sales\\_to\\_pakistan\\_new\\_.php](http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2007/11/us_arms_sales_to_pakistan_new_.php) (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>19</sup> Glenn Kessler, “Congress Sets Limits on Aid to Pakistan”, *The Washington Post*, December 20, 2007, A-24, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/19/AR2007121902502.html> (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>20</sup> Spengler, “The Demographics of Radical Islam”, *Online Asia Times*, August 23, 2005, [http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front\\_Page/GH23Aa01.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front_Page/GH23Aa01.html) (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>21</sup> Robert Spencer, “The Crusade We Must Fight Today”, in *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades)*, CD, (Ashland, OR: Blackstone Audiobooks, 2005).

<sup>22</sup> Barack Obama, "Inaugural Address", January 20, 2009, <http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/01/20/obama.politics/index.html> (accessed March 14, 2009).

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

<sup>24</sup> David Greenberg, "Lincoln's Crackdown", *Slate*, November 30, 2001, <http://www.slate.com/id/2059132/>, (accessed March 14, 2009).